

Combinatorics on Ideals and Axiom A

James D. Sharp

1/28/1993

1 Introduction

The following notion of forcing was introduced by Grigorieff [2]: Let $\mathfrak{I} \subset \omega$ be an ideal, then $\mathbb{P}$ is the set of all functions $p : \omega \rightarrow 2$ such that $\text{dom}(p) \in \mathfrak{I}$. The usual Cohen forcing corresponds to the case when $\mathfrak{I}$ is the ideal of finite subsets of ω . In [2] Grigorieff proves that if $\mathfrak{I}$ is the dual of a p-point ultrafilter, then ω_1 is preserved in the generic extension. Later, when Shelah introduced the notion of proper forcing, many people observed that Grigorieff forcing was proper. One way of proving this is to show that player II has a winning strategy in the game $\mathcal{G}_\omega$ for $\mathbb{P}$ (see [3], page 91.)

The notion of Axiom A forcing was introduced by Baumgartner [1]. If $\mathbb{P}$ satisfies Axiom A, then player II has a winning strategy in the game $\mathcal{G}_\omega$ and thus is proper. Indeed, most of the naturally occurring proper notions of forcing are Axiom A (e.g. Mathias or Laver forcing). Thus it is natural to ask whether or not Grigorieff forcing satisfies Axiom A. The main result of this paper is a negative answer to this question. We will prove this by introducing another game $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{U}$ and showing that if $\mathbb{P}$ were Axiom A then player II would have a winning strategy in this game. We will then prove that the game $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{U}$ is undetermined.

2 Definitions and Preliminaries

Throughout this paper $\mathcal{U}$ will denote a p-point ultrafilter and $\mathfrak{I}$ will denote the dual ideal. We let $[X]^{<\omega} = \{s \subseteq X \mid |s| < \omega\}$. And we will denote ordinal names by $\dot{\alpha}$. We let $\text{Seq}(X)$ denote the set of finite sequences of elements of X . If $s = \langle x_0, \dots, x_n \rangle \in \text{Seq}(X)$ and $y \in X$, then $s * \langle y \rangle = \langle x_0, \dots, x_n, y \rangle \in \text{Seq}(X)$.

⁰This paper forms part of the author's dissertation, written under the direction of Simon Thomas

DEFINITION. The game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is for two players playing alternatively. Player I plays a partition of ω , $\{I_n \mid n \in \omega\}$, such that for all n , $I_n \in \mathfrak{I}$ and player II plays finite subsets $F_n \subset I_n$. Player II wins iff

$$\bigcup_{n \in \omega} F_n \in \mathcal{U}. \quad (1)$$

Note that this definition makes sense for an arbitrary non-principal ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$. However, if $\mathcal{U}$ is not a p-point, then player I clearly has a winning strategy. DEFINITION. A partial order $\mathbb{P}$ is said to satisfy Axiom A if there is a collection of partial orders $\{\leq_n \mid n \in \omega\}$ of $\mathbb{P}$ satisfying:

- i) $p \leq_0 q$ implies $p \leq q$
- ii) $p \leq_{n+1} q$ implies $p \leq_n q$
- iii) if $\langle p_n \mid n \in \omega \rangle$ is a sequence such that $p_0 \geq_0 p_1 \geq_1 p_2 \geq_2 \dots \geq_{n-1} p_n \geq_n \dots$ (called a fusion sequence), then there is a $q \in \mathbb{P}$ such that for all n , $q \leq_n p$
- iv) for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, for all $n \in \omega$, and for all ordinal names $\dot{\alpha}$, there exists $q \leq_n p$ and a countable set B such that $q \Vdash \dot{\alpha} \in B$.

DEFINITION. Grigorieff Forcing $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}) = \{p : \omega \rightarrow 2 \mid \text{dom}(p) \in \mathfrak{I}\}$ where $q \leq p$ iff $q \supseteq p$.

The main results in this paper are the following two theorems.

Theorem 1 *Grigorieff forcing does not satisfy Axiom A.*

Theorem 2 *The game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is not determined.*

3 Grigorieff Forcing and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$

In this section we will prove the following Lemma:

Lemma 1 *If $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U})$ satisfies Axiom A, then player II has a winning strategy in the game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$.*

PROOF. Suppose $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U})$ satisfies Axiom A.

Claim 1 *Let $p \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U})$, $n \in \omega$, and $I \in \mathfrak{I}$, then there exists $q \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U})$ such that*

$$q \leq_n p \text{ and } |I \setminus \text{dom}(q)| < \omega. \quad (2)$$

PROOF OF CLAIM 1: Let p , n , and I be given. We may assume I is infinite. Let $\{Y_\alpha \mid \alpha < 2^\omega\}$ be an enumeration of $\wp(I)$ and set $\dot{\alpha} = \{\langle \alpha, p_\alpha \rangle \mid \alpha < 2^\omega\}$ where $p_\alpha : I \rightarrow 2$ is the characteristic function of Y_α . Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U})$ satisfies Axiom A, by (iv) there's $q \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U})$ and a countable set B , such that $q \leq_n p$ and $q \Vdash \dot{\alpha} \in B$. But then $|I \setminus \text{dom}(q)| < \omega$ as required. $\square$

Now we describe a winning strategy for player II in the game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Suppose player I plays I_0 at the 0^{th} move, then player II sets $p_0 = \chi_{I_0}$ and plays $F_0 = \emptyset$. After the $n - 1^{st}$ turn, player I has played $I_0, \dots, I_{n-1}$ and player II has played $F_0, \dots, F_{n-1}$ and chosen $p_0 \geq_0 p_1 \geq_1 \dots \geq_{n-2} p_{n-1}$. At the n^{th} move player I plays I_n . Then by the claim there exists $p_n \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U})$ such that $p_n \leq_{n-1} p_{n-1}$ and $|I_n \setminus \text{dom}(p_n)| < \omega$. Thus player II can play $F_n = I_n \setminus \text{dom}(p_n)$. At the end of the game $\langle p_n \mid n \in \omega \rangle$ forms a fusion sequence, and it follows from Axiom A (iii), that $\cup \text{dom}(p_n) \in \mathcal{I}$. And thus player II wins. $\blacksquare$

Notice that lemma 1 and theorem 2 imply theorem 1.

4 The Game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is undetermined

We shall prove the theorem as two lemmas.

Lemma 2 *Player I does not have a winning strategy in the game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$.*

PROOF. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that player I has a winning strategy. Let $\sigma : \text{Seq}([\omega]^{<\omega}) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ be player I's winning strategy. Then $\text{ran}(\sigma)$ is countable. Let $\langle Z_n \mid n \in \omega \rangle$ be an enumeration of $\text{ran}(\sigma)$ such that $\sigma(\emptyset) = Z_0$, let $J_0 = Z_0$ and for $n \geq 1$ let $J_n = Z_n \setminus \cup_{j < n} J_j$. Since $\cup \text{ran}(\sigma) = \omega$, the set $\langle J_n \mid n \in \omega \rangle$ forms a partition of ω . Thus there exists $Y \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $|Y \cap J_n| < \omega$ and hence $|Z_n \cap Y| < \omega$ for all $n \in \omega$. Now consider the following game where player I plays by σ and player II plays

$$F_n = Y \cap \sigma(\emptyset, F_0, \dots, F_{n-1}) \quad (3)$$

Notice that for all n , there exists some m such that

$$F_n = Y \cap Z_m. \quad (4)$$

Clearly $\cup F_n = Y \in \mathcal{U}$, so player II wins. $\blacksquare$ To prove lemma 3 we shall need the following definitions and results from Grigorieff [2].

DEFINITION.

- i) $A \subset \text{Seq}([\omega]^{<\omega})$ is a p-tree if it is non-empty and closed under taking initial segments.
- ii) If $s \in A$, the ramification of A at s , denoted $R_A(s)$, is the set of all $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega}$ such that $s * \langle a \rangle \in A$.

- iii) A is an $\mathcal{I}$ -p-tree if for any $s \in A$, there exists $X \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $[X]^{<\omega} \subseteq R_A(s)$.
- iv) H is an $\mathcal{I}$ -p-branch of A if it is a branch such that $\cup\{H(n) \mid n \in \omega\} \in \mathcal{U}$.

Theorem 3 (Grigorieff [2]) *Every $\mathcal{I}$ -p-tree has an $\mathcal{I}$ -p-branch.*

Lemma 3 *Player II does not have a winning strategy in the game $G_{\mathcal{U}}$.*

PROOF. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that player II has a winning strategy μ . Player I will construct a “tree of games” such that along each branch player II plays by μ , but there will be a branch such that player I wins the corresponding game. First we need the following technical result.

Claim 2 *For all $n \in \omega$ and for any sequence $I_0, I_1, \dots, I_n$ of pairwise disjoint elements of $\mathfrak{I}$, there exists $Y \in \mathcal{U}$, $Y \subseteq (\omega \setminus \cup\{I_n \mid i \leq n\})$ satisfying:*

$$(\forall t \in [Y]^{<\omega})(\exists I \in \mathfrak{I})[(t \subset I \subset (\omega \setminus \bigcup_{i \leq n} I_i)) \wedge (\mu(I_0, \dots, I_n, I) \cap t = \emptyset)]. \quad (5)$$

PROOF OF CLAIM. Let $n, I_0, \dots, I_n$ be given. Suppose the claim is false. Then we can define, by induction on $m \in \omega$, a sequence of pairs $\langle X_m, s_m \rangle$ such that

- i) $X_0 = \omega \setminus \bigcup_{i \leq n} I_i$
- ii) for all $m \geq 1$, $X_m = X_{m-1} \setminus s_{m-1}$
- iii) $(\forall I \in \mathfrak{I})(s_m \subset I \subset X_0) \rightarrow \mu(I_0, \dots, I_n, I) \cap s_m \neq \emptyset$

If we set $J_0 = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} s_{2i}$ and $J_1 = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} s_{2i+1}$ then one of these must be in $\mathfrak{I}$, say $J_0 \in \mathfrak{I}$. But then for all $i \leq \omega$, $\mu(I_0, \dots, I_n, J_0) \cap s_{2i} \neq \emptyset$, so $\mu(I_0, \dots, I_n, J_0) = \omega$, contradicting the assumption that μ is a winning strategy for player II. $\square$

Player I constructs a tree $A \subset \text{Seq}(\{\langle I, F, s \rangle \mid I \in \mathfrak{I}, F, s \in [I]^{<\omega}\})$ by induction on the height n of a node such that, if $\langle \langle I_0, F_0, s_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle I_n, F_n, s_n \rangle \rangle \in A$ then

- i) $I_i \cap I_j = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$
- ii) $(1 \leq i \leq n)(F_i = \mu(I_1, \dots, I_i))$
- iii) $(0 \leq i \leq n)(s_i \cap F_i = \emptyset)$
- iv) $I_0 = F_0 = s_0 = \emptyset$.
- v) The projection map $\pi : \langle \langle I_0, F_0, s_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle I_n, F_n, s_n \rangle \rangle \rightarrow \langle s_0, \dots, s_n \rangle$ is an injection.

Suppose we've decided which $B = \langle \langle I_0, F_0, s_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle I_n, F_n, s_n \rangle \rangle \in A$. Fix such a B. By the claim, there exists $Y \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying property 5. For each $t \in [Y]^{<\omega}$, choose I_t satisfying property 5. Let $R_A(B) = \{ \langle I, F, s \rangle \mid s \in [Y]^{<\omega}, I = I_s, F = \mu(I_0, \dots, I_n, I_s) \}$.

Let $\tau \subset Seq([\omega]^{<\omega})$ be the tree obtained from A via the projection map π . Then, by the construction, τ is an $\mathfrak{I}$ -p-tree, and hence has an $\mathfrak{I}$ -p-branch H. Let $\langle \langle I_n, F_n, H(n) \rangle \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be the corresponding branch in A. Then, since $\cup \{ H(n) \mid n \in \omega \} \in \mathcal{U}$, this is a play of $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ which player I wins. But player II has used the strategy μ in this play, which contradicts the assumption that μ is a winning strategy for player II. ■

References

- [1] Baumgartner, J. (1983). Iterated Forcing. In *Surveys in Set Theory* (Mathias, A.R.D., ed.), pp.1-59, Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Grigorieff, S. (1971). Combinatorics on ideals and forcing, *Ann. Math. Logic* **3**, 363-94.
- [3] Jech, T. (1986). *Multiple Forcing*, Cambridge University Press.

CURRENT ADDRESS:

James D. Sharp
Department of Mathematics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
email: jsharp@math.rutgers.edu